therefore, still in favour of retaining *Eubranchus* for the group of *E. tricolor* and using either *Capellinia*, based on *capellinii* (=*cingulata*), or *Amphorina*, based on *alberti* (=*farrani*), for the remaining species.

Z.N.(S.) 1106.

I now agree with Dr. Lemche that it would be better to suppress the name *Diaphoreolis* as a *nomen dubium*, and redescribe the genus if it should subsequently be rediscovered. With regard to his final suggestion, though, it seems to me that if the original name were to be suppressed for the purposes of both priority and homonymy, the name would still date from the first subsequent validation and such an action would not therefore serve any real purpose.

SUPPORT FOR PROPOSAL TO SUPPRESS GENERIC NAMES *TANAGRA* LINNAEUS, 1764, AND *TANAGRA* LINNAEUS, 1766; AND TO PLACE *EUPHONIA* DESMAREST, 1806, ON THE OFFICIAL LIST OF GENERIC NAMES IN ZOOLOGY (AVES)

(see volume 20, pages 296–302, volume 21, pages 23)

By Eugene Eisenmann (*The American Museum of Natural History, New York, U.S.A.*)

The present Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature of the International Ornithological Congress has previously submitted a recommendation on this question supporting *Proposal B*. (Those originally supporting *Proposal A* have withdrawn their application.) As a Member of the present S.C.O.N., I joined in the recommendation; here I wish only to emphasize an argument based on experience as a specialist in neotropical birds.

Aside from disputed applicability, the main reason for suppressing *Tanagra* for the large genus commonly called euphonias is the confusion with the almost identical name of another large genus of the same family (Thraupidae) currently called *Tangara* Brisson, 1760. Confusion between these two names is not restricted to printers and stenographers; I personally know it to occur in correspondence and oral discussion between ornithologists. The confusion is compounded by the fact that two tanagers with overlapping ranges in Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, Bolivia, Venezuela and Brazil, currently bear the names *Tanagra xanthogaster* and *Tangara xanthogastra* (see de Schauensee, *Birds of Colombia*, pp. 354, 359, 1964). The easiest way to remove the confusion is to suppress the Linnaean names *Tanagra* 1764 and 1766, thus restoring as the senior name *Euphonia* Desmarest, used for so long that it became and remains the common name of the group.

Conformity with a common name is no reason, of course, for suppressing a valid scientific name, but the circumstances that a long used scientific name has become the accepted venacular name is a consideration in weighing whether a proposed use of the plenary powers for other reasons will cause undue inconvenience. Here reversion to former usage by reinstatement of *Euphonia* will be easy because the birds are called euphonias.

By B. P. Hall (*British Museum (Natural History), London*)

I would like to support Proposal B put forward by Prof. Mayr and Dr. Storer (p. 301), for the reasons given, and particularly since Proposal A met with opposition from American ornithologists, since they are the ones most intimately concerned